1	
2	
3	
4	CALIFORNIA HIGH-SPEED RAIL AUTHORITY
5	EIR/EIS PUBLIC COMMENTS HEARING
6	
7	GILROY CITY HALL, CITY COUNCIL CHAMBERS
8	7351 ROSANNA STREET
9	GILROY, CALIFORNIA
10	AUGUST 29, 2007 - 4:00 O'CLOCK P.M.
11	
12	
13	000
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	REPORTED BY: DEBORAH FUQUA, CSR#12948
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

1	APPEARANCES					
2						
3		ROD	DIRI	DON		
4		Boar	d Memi	ber		
5		California High-	Speed	Rail Authority		
6		(Mo	derat	or)		
7						
8		MEHD	I MOR	SHED		
9		Executi	ve Di	rector		
10		California High-	Speed	Rail Authority		
11						
12		DAN	LEAV	ITT		
13		Deput	y Dir	ector		
14		California High-	Speed	Rail Authority		
15						
16		PUBLIC	S P	E A K E R S		
17	PS1	ROLAND VELASCO	PS9	JAMES HELMER		
18	PS2	DON GAGE	PS10	JOE THOMPSON		
19	PS3	GREG SELLERS	PS11	JOHN SCHERRER		
20	PS4	DAVE POTTER	PS12	TOM HERRMANN		
21	PS5	JILL LUTES	PS13	GABRIEL SANTOS		
22	PS6	BARBARA PATRICK	PS14	ROD JENSEN		
23	PS7	ANDREW CHESLEY	PS15	JACK STURLE		
24	PS8	DON PEREIRA	PS16	LARRY COPE		
25						

Wednesday, August 29, 2007

which we are sitting.

4:05 o'clock p.m.

---00---

PROCEEDINGS

BOARD MEMBER ROD DIRIDON: We'll proceed.

The meeting is now formally in session, with the California High-Speed Rail Authority acting as a hearing board for the purpose of determining -- gaining testimony that will assist in determining the route which is called colloquially the Northern Mountain Crossing Route between the Central Valley and Santa Clara Valley. That route will be decided by virtue of a study that's been conducted over the past two years and the data supporting that study is available to each of you in your library in total -- and there's about 3,000 pages -- or in summary, again, in your library. And an additional summary is provided for you to review in the foyer of the Gilroy City Council Chambers in

I'm giving you some additional information so that the reporter can have that in the transcript. And I'll continue to do that for a moment.

Remember that the California High-Speed Rail

Authority was begun in law in 1996. It has been in

operation now since that time and has conducted various

studies in accordance with federal law. That federal

law relates to the requirement of having program-level environmental clearance before we can proceed with the project. That program-level environmental clearance has been certified now in regard to all of the corridors for the 700-plus-mile High-Speed Rail Authority project in the state of California, all the corridors and staging locations, except for the portion connecting the Central Valley with the Bay Area. And that is what we're in the process of doing today.

We have had public hearings in San Francisco, San Jose, Oakland, Livermore, and we have one today here and one tomorrow in Merced. And then the final one is on September 18th in Stockton. And that will be -- it's not in the normal noticing information that came to you originally. So I'll give you the address on that. The Stockton hearing is, again, at 4:00 o'clock in the afternoon. And it's at 555 East Weber -- I can't read my own writing -- Weber Street, and that is in Stockton in the Regional Government Building in the City of Stockton.

You are invited, of course, to attend any and all of those public hearings and invited to provide testimony orally at the public hearings or in writing at any time before the public hearings close. And that will be at the conclusion of the Stockton public

hearing.

So if you think of something that you should have said that you didn't say at the hearing today, or if you have a friend who would like to supply testimony, please encourage them to do so by sending that testimony to the High-Speed Rail Authority office in Sacramento. And the address is on the material that you can view in the foyer of the council chambers.

There won't be a time limit on your presentations, but we would ask you, please, to be as brief as you can in order to allow as many people to speak as possible and also not to be redundant. Don't say the same things over and over and over again if you would -- could, please.

The hearing will be open until 6:00 o'clock. That means that, if we are concluded early -- and we don't have as many people to testify at this hearing as we did at the first two -- but if we do conclude early, the record will stay open until 6:00 o'clock. The reporter will stay here. And you will be able to offer your testimony on the record at any time after the hearing board leaves.

I made one factual error. I'm sure there's others, too, but this one was caught. And that is that the comment period will stay open not just until the

Stockton hearing but until September 28. So you can submit your written comments even after the Stockton hearing clear through September 28th.

I should note that by law, the consultants on the High-Speed Rail Authority staff will have to respond to every one of the comments. Every comment will have a response. And that will be available to you in the report that comes to the High-Speed Rail Authority for action. And we hope that action will be at our board meeting in October, if the responses are concluded in time for the meeting in October. If not, we'll carry it over until November.

I think that prepares you for your comments. And please, just come forward and speak into the microphone. I'll identify you. If I've done that inappropriately -- and I oftentimes do -- then please correct me so that the record has your names and affiliations, if any, appropriately declared in the transcript that's going to be provided to us.

We'll have a welcoming comment first and testimony from Roland Velasco. Roland is the city council member from Gilroy. He sits up here normally, but he's allowed us to use his chairs today. Roland will be here to give us a welcome and to provide testimony for the City of Gilroy.

ROLAND VELASCO: Thank you. I'm Roland Velasco.

I'm a Gilroy City council member. I'm speaking here as an individual council member and not necessarily on behalf of the council.

First off, I'd like to welcome everybody to Gilroy City Hall and thank the Board for coming here to Gilroy to have your public hearing here.

As you are trying to reach out to various communities, you know, I understand the -- each jurisdiction is looking out for its own interest. And you're trying to gather all the information possible.

For us here in Gilroy, you know, if a high-speed rail is going to be built, it obviously makes the most sense, we believe, for it to travel over the Pacheco Pass alignment. This alignment through -- over Pacheco Pass through Gilroy to San Jose and up the Peninsula to San Francisco, as I said, makes the most sense.

The market we're trying to serve with

PSG1-2

High-Speed Rail is the L.A. to the Bay Area. If our

goal is to try to relieve traffic congestion and if our

goal is trying to relieve air congestion with air

flights back and forth, then obviously the L.A. over

Pacheco Pass to Gilroy, again, makes the most sense.

In addition with the Pacheco Pass alignment,

PSG1-3

PSG1-1

you get to do one thing and not do another. What you PSG1-3 Cont. do get to do is, hopefully, have Gilroy as a hub to draw in the Monterey Bay Area, including Salinas, Carmel, Hollister, Monterey, and Watsonville. What you PSG1-4 don't get to do is build an expensive bridge or tunnel to connect it over Altamont Pass to San Francisco. So with that, I would like to respectfully ask PSG1-5 that the Pacheco Pass alignment be selected as the best choice for linking Southern California to the Bay Area. So thank you again for coming, and thank you for the opportunity to speak. BOARD MEMBER ROD DIRIDON: Councilman, thank you for being such a cordial host and for your testimony. The next person will be a person who sat here for many years as the mayor. And you're chair of the board this year? DON GAGE: Yes. BOARD MEMBER ROD DIRIDON: So Don Gage, a member of the county board of supervisors from the South County Area and chair of the county board of supervisors and a member of the Valley Transportation Authority Board will be our next presenter. Don will be followed by Greg Sellers of the Morgan Hill City Council. Thanks, Rod. I'm going to go through DON GAGE:

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

this quickly, and I'm going to read it because there's a lot of information here. And it will take me less time to do that than to try to expound on that because I know the time is valuable. But I'm representing the VTA. And as a member of the county board, I'm the representative. So I'm the director on the VTA.

And the Santa Clara Valley Transportation

Authority strongly supports the concept of the

High-Speed Rail line connecting Northern and Southern

California as a way to relieve traffic and ground

transportation between the Bay Area and Southern

California.

PSG2-2

PSG2-1

VTA also believes that the Pacheco Pass alignment makes more sense as the entry point for the High-Speed Rail trains to the Bay Area.

In 2005, the California High-Speed Rail
Authority Draft Statewide EIR and EIS concluded that
Pacheco Pass was a better alignment because it provides
better frequency of service to the critical Silicon
Valley job market, a primary economic engine for both
California and the United States as a whole. It more
effectively and efficiently meets current and future
inter-city travel demands, making it better fit for
High-Speed Rail's basic project objectives. It does
not require a new San Francisco Bay crossing, which

would include project schedule delays.

PSG2-2 Cont.

We believe the information presented in the Authority's Draft Bay Area to the Central Valley High-Speed Rail Train Program EIR and EIS does not change these conclusions. The Pacheco Pass alignment would provide faster, more direct and more frequent service to the three largest urban centers in the Bay Area: San Francisco, San Jose, and Oakland.

To demonstrate the need for direct high-speed PSG2-3 rail service to San Jose, the tenth largest city in the nation and the largest in the Bay Area, consider that the Authority's Draft Statewide Program estimates that by 2010, the Mineta San Jose International Airport will have more flights serving the Bay Area-to-Southern California market than the Oakland and San Francisco airports combined.

As one of the partner agencies in the CalTrain PSG2-4

Commuter Rail Service, VTA believes the Pacheco Pass

alignment is more consistent with CalTrain's

corridor-wide long-range plans.

Finally, air traffic between the Bay Area and Southern California will continue to grow in the future, but all three major airports in Bay Area are severely constrained in terms of their ability to expand. The Bay Area-Southern California air traffic

1	corridor is already one of the busiest in the nation PSG2-5					
2	and will only get worse. Therefore, the primary	Cont.				
3	purpose of High-Speed Rail must be to provide					
4	competitive long-distance transit alternatives between					
5	Northern and Southern California. And the Pacheco Pass					
6	alignment is the best alignment for achieving that					
7	purposes.					
8	Thank you for your time. I'll leave this with	PSG2-6				
9	the reporter, and you can put this into the record if					
10	you'd like.					
11	Thank you.					
12	BOARD MEMBER ROD DIRIDON: Thank you,					
13	Mr. Chairman. And it's always nice to be in Gilroy.					
14	DON GAGE: Especially when it's 108, right?					
15	BOARD MEMBER ROD DIRIDON: My car said 97 on the					
16	windshield when I drove in.					
17	DON GAGE: Was that on the speedometer?					
18	BOARD MEMBER ROD DIRIDON: Well, I was a little					
19	late, too.					
20	Greg, please proceed.					
21	And after Greg will be David Potter.					
22	And Mr. Supervisor, I apologize for taking you					
23	a little out of order. I didn't find your card right					
24	now.					
25	But he's the supervisor of District 5 in the					

county of Monterey.

GREG SELLERS: I appreciate, it Mr. Diridon. And
I appreciate you mentioning that as well. I'm familiar
with Mr. Potter. And I know he would have taken
offense if we hadn't pointed out that he was, in rank,
higher than I am. But I appreciate the opportunity to PSG3-1
address you today.

And I don't want to reiterate. I was able to join you, as you know, last Friday in San Jose. And appreciated that opportunity.

As a council member of Morgan Hill, I want to mention a few things briefly. One, actually, if you look over your shoulder, you'll realize that the history of rail is significant in our region. You'll see it on the seal of Gilroy. And it has had a significant impact on the entire region. San Benito County, at one point, had a much larger population even proportionately than it does today, largely because of the rail service there.

We are looking forward to seeing rail service PSG3-3 have again that kind of positive impact on our entire region. But we are convinced, as I mentioned last week, that that impact is already -- will be felt immediately because the need is there. And it will be PSG3-4 seen from day one as we're able to get service through

PSG3-2

the Pacheco route.

PSG3-4 Cont.

PSG3-5

The last point I wanted to make, we here in this region, pride ourselves on our natural beauty, the entire region. And certainly, if you include Monterey County, it goes all the way through southern Santa Clara County, among the more beautiful places not only in California but in the world. And we want to do everything we can to keep it that way. Therefore, we scrutinized the project proposal to ensure that the impacts would be minimal.

We have the largest state park in the region -- in the state here in our region, Henry Coe, and have looked carefully at the impacts on the park, which not only comes close to the southern edge in the Pacheco Pass area but also just west of the park in -- as it travels north on the proposed route.

And those impacts and impacts generally on the environment will be minimal as care has been taken in that regard. And we appreciate that. And therefore, yet another reason, we saw Friday that the impacts, as Congress Member Lofgren pointed out, on the environment through the alternate route will be significant. They will be minimal in the Pacheco route. So that is yet another reason why we believe that this is the preferred alternative.

PSG3-6

Thanks for the opportunity to address you again today, and I appreciate you taking the time to come down there.

BOARD MEMBER ROD DIRIDON: Counsel Member, thank you for being here again and for your varied testimony on the topic.

Supervisor Potter will be followed by -- Jill Lutes, is that the proper --

JILL LUTES: Yes.

DAVE POTTER: Thank you, Mr. Chair. It's my pleasure to be here today. And I certainly take no offense at Mr. Seller's preceding me. In fact, I wouldn't even be here if it weren't for Greg; he worked on my campaign. So -- he's quite pricey, but he did a good job.

I'm going to respect your request for lack of redundancy. We all know that we're not going to pave our way out of gridlock issues statewide. Monterey County, who I happen to represent, has acknowledged that the Rail is part of the solution.

I'm here in a variety of capacities today. I am chair of the Board of Supervisors, vice chair of the Transportation Agency. I chair the Rail Policy Committee for Monterey County. And I'm also the chair of a state rail committee called the Coast Rail

PSG4-1

PSG4-2

Coordinating Council. That council's responsibility is PSG4-3 to try to increase and improve rail service on the coastal corridor, recognizing that that corridor is a vital rail asset that has gone under-utilized historically.

Rail service exists north of Monterey County as far as Gilroy, commuter rail. To the south, we have it as far as San Luis Obispo. But it does not go through or come to Monterey County. The only train that comes through Monterey County is the Amtrak's notoriously late Coast Starlight.

The County of Monterey has recognized that there are a variety of rail opportunities. And we have worked hard and aggressively to promote three programs that we think work extremely well with the Pacheco Pass alignment, acknowledging that stops in Gilroy and San Jose are of significant regional benefit from a ridership standpoint.

We have a program that I think we will see implemented in the very near future. That's the extension of the CalTrain from Gilroy down to Salinas. That is a service that exists, has an effective delivery schedule, and we will be moving forward with that project's implementation shortly.

We are also looking for a return, a variation

PSG4-4

PSG4-5

Cont.

on the old Del Monte Express, a train that was put into PSG4-5 service to accommodate the visiting public, specifically for the old Del Monte Hotel. Ironically, we have on the weekends and, quite frankly, on a daily basis now, serious gridlock within the Monterey Peninsula, caused in a very large part by the visiting We are an international destination, but we are served by two-lane highways. Highway 68, 156, and Highway 1 are two-lane highways, and they clog up very quickly.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

The other rail project which we are excited about is the implementation of the Coast Daylight, a through train on a daily basis from San Francisco to That train does not have the conflicts that the Coast Starlight does and, for that reason, will serve on the coastal corridor as an attractive, effective, scenic train that will work for commute purposes but also for recreational travelers.

We are strongly in support of the entire vision of High-Speed Rail and very enthusiastically support the Pacheco Pass alignment. Look forward to, at some point, re-testifying and continuing to work in whatever way we can to help with the implementation of High-Speed Rail in the State of California and the

United States as a whole.

PSG4-6

Quite obviously, the most historic moment was PSG4-7 1 the driving of the Golden Spike. We'd like to have you 2 come down when we drive the Golden Tee in Monterey 3 County and get our rail service up and running. 4 Thank you for the opportunity to testify. 5 BOARD MEMBER ROD DIRIDON: Thank you, 6 7 Mr. Chairman. And we really appreciate you coming the long distance that you had to come today. 8 This is Jill Lutes, Salinas City Council. And 9 Jill will be followed by Barbara Patrick, California 10 Partnership for San Joaquin Valley. 11 And I apologize for interrupting you. 12 JILL LUTES: Good afternoon, and I thank you for 13 the opportunity to let me speak. 14 Actually, I have -- I had quite a bit to say, 15 but most of its's already been said. So in the 16 interest of redundancy, I won't take too much time. 17 But I would like to echo a few of the comments PSG5-1 18 that Supervisor Potter brought up. And I want to speak 19 specifically from the viewpoint of Salinas. Dave and I 20 have worked for the past ten years trying to get that 21 CalTrain extension from Salinas established, from 22 23 Gilroy to Salinas. We have a number of people in

Salinas that are commuting to the Bay Area, and we are

trying to establish rail service, obviously, for

24

25

environmental reasons and to get people off the dangerous highway.

PSG5-1 Cont.

PSG5-2

One of the things that I think it's important for you to realize is that Salinas is only 37 miles from here by rail. We have a population approaching 200,000. The whole Monterey Bay Area region, which is a three-county region, has well over 710,000 residents. Actually, that was in the year 2000. We will be approaching a population of over a million by the year 2030. So we have a significant population growth. We are providing a lot of the jobs for Silicon Valley.

PSG5-3

It's critical that we have that rail connection. Salinas is investing millions of dollars into our transportation hub and to our new station.

We're expecting to get significant amounts of money from the federal government, we hope, with the new start moneys.

So we've worked closely with San Jose. We really support the Pacheco alignment. And our mayor did write a letter, which I'd like to place into the record, supporting the alignment from the Pacheco Pass. And I will leave this with you.

Most of the things Dave Potter has already said, so I won't take up more time. But I will give you a brochure talking about how Monterey is truly

PSG5-4

investing in our transportation future and specifically PSG5-4 1 how we're investing in our rail program. 2 Thank you. 3 BOARD MEMBER ROD DIRIDON: Thank you, Council 4 Member. And congratulations on all the work you're 5 doing for mass transportation down there. 6 JILL LUTES: Thank you. We're excited. 7 BOARD MEMBER ROD DIRIDON: Barbara Patrick will 8 speak next for the California Partnership for San 9 Joaquin Valley. 10 And Andrew Chesley, San Joaquin Council of 11 Governments will be following Barbara. 12 BARBARA PATRICK: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 13 The San Joaquin Valley partnership is a unique PSG6-1 14 public-private collaboration that was created by 15 Governor Schwarzenegger in response to many of the 16 problems that we have in the eight-county region of the 17 18 San Joaquin Valley. It includes ten work groups, several of which 19 are actively involved in supporting High-Speed Rail 20 throughout the San Joaquin Valley. Implementation of 21 High-Speed Rail would support the work of the 22 23 Transportation, Economic Development, and Air Quality 24 Work Groups.

The Transportation Work Group of the

25

PSG6-2

Partnership has recommended to the Partnership Board 1

that the Altamont Pass alignment be supported because

PSG6-2 Cont.

it would serve the entire San Joaquin Valley from 3

Bakersfield to Sacramento. We believe that it is

imperative that the benefits of High-Speed Rail through 5

central California accrue all the way from Kern County 6

up through San Joaquin County. And we also believe 7

that it's imperative that the Valley be involved in the

very first phase of implementation. 9

2

4

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

inventory.

PSG6-3

The San Joaquin Valley is an extreme non-attainment of the federal ozone standard. more Californians and others have moved to the Central Valley to find affordable homes, the effects of increased population and vehicle miles traveled have come to account for a larger share of the emissions

The San Joaquin Valley has been home to the highest population growth in the state, and this trend is projected to continue. Through the year 2030, the growth rate of the region is projected to be 65 percent higher than the state average. Projected growth in passenger vehicle travel in the region will only exacerbate the Valley's air pollution problem.

Those who choose to be transported by High-Speed Rail rather than passenger rail will be part of the solution to our traffic congestion and air quality challenge.

PSG6-3 Cont.

PSG6-4

We believe that High-Speed Rail will impact the Valley's economy. The unemployment rates in the Valley exceed the state average. Current unemployment rates range anywhere from 7.3 percent in Madera County to 9.8 percent in Merced County, which has the second highest unemployment rate in the state. All but one of the counties experienced significant growth in their unemployment rate over the last year.

We believe that the Valley's economy will be positively impacted by the High-Speed Rail bringing additional jobs to the area with some of the highest unemployment rates in the state.

PSG6-5

We are very bullish on High-Speed Rail. And we also believe that it needs to serve the entire valley through the Altamont Pass.

Thank you.

BOARD MEMBER ROD DIRIDON: Barbara, thank you for being with us and coming so far to do so.

BARBARA PATRICK: It was my pleasure.

BOARD MEMBER ROD DIRIDON: Andrew Chesley followed by -- I think it's Don Pereira. Do I have that right?

ANDREW CHESLEY: Thank you Authority Member
Diridon, members of the staff and the audience here

today. My name is Andrew Chesley. I'm the executive director for the San Joaquin Council of Governments.

The San Joaquin Partnership for the San Joaquin Valley asks that the Regional Policy Council, a group composed of two elected officials from each of the eight counties in the San Joaquin Valley take into consideration the question of what is the appropriate route for High-Speed Rail between the San Joaquin Valley and the Bay Area.

And a unanimous vote was cast on that issue.

And unanimously, the group selected the Altamont Pass as the alternative that they wish to recommend. The Regional Policy Council is very strongly in favor of High-Speed Rail and wishes to do everything to help the Authority in supporting this effort as you move forward, hopefully, in 2008 to a bond measure on the November 2008 ballot.

And it identifies the Altamont Pass as being the appropriate route, not just as for the reasons that Former Supervisor Patrick explained earlier, but for a range of other issues that appear to be compelling in terms of selecting the Altamont Pass. It serves the most population centers among the two alternatives. It offers a Valley connection to the East Bay. It best supplies connections to BART and to many of the other

PSG7-3

PSG7-2

PSG7-1

Bay Area transit operations in Bay Area.

PSG7-3 Cont.

It offers the opportunity to leverage investments in the High-Speed Rail, especially in regards to the Altamont Commuter Express, which is in the process of working on acquiring a right of way between Stockton and in the area of Oakland along the Altamont Pass and to the Livermore Valley.

Certainly there is a synergy there in terms of High-Speed Rail as well as the Altamont Commuter Express.

It provides the first phase high-speed rail service for San Joaquin and Stanislaus County, in addition to the six other Valley counties. Stanislaus PSG7-4 and San Joaquin counties account for 1.5 million in population to date and have been identified by the Department of Finance as the two fastest growing urban counties in the State of California, looking out to the year 2040.

Like many of the speakers before, the Regional PSG7-5

Policy Council believes strongly that the connection

from Los Angeles to the Bay Area is exceptionally

important. And in fact, your studies indicate that

both alternatives achieve that end. While the

connection between Los Angeles and San Jose would be

ten minutes longer through the Altamont Pass, there

would be no difference in terms of time to San Francisco and to Oakland under this scenario.

PSG7-5 Cont.

PSG7-6

And under the Altamont Pass scenario, you would be able to provide, eventually, a better connection to future riders in the Sacramento area which, if we choose the Pacheco Pass, it means that the Sacramento riders in the future would have to make a 41-minute additional connection through the Pacheco Pass as opposed to the Altamont.

PSG7-7

Altamont alignment capital costs are slightly higher, about 1 percent over than the Pacheco Pass. So I certainly think, at this point in time, in terms of the engineering that's been done, that's well within the margin of error in terms of looking at this. But also operating costs are less in the Altamont Pass alignment. And ridership is slightly higher in the Altamont Pass alignment based upon forecasting that your consultants have done in regards to this.

One of the other points that we've made, a strong point, is San Joaquin Valley is engaged in a very aggressive blueprint effort from Kern County to San Joaquin County. And building High-Speed Rail as a component of the future development plans that we have that are coming out of the blueprint effort creates a great opportunity for the State of California as well

PSG7-8

as for the San Joaquin Valley in terms of connections 1 PSG7-8 Cont. to other regions of the state. 2 PSG7-9 The San Joaquin Valley is a non-attainment 3 area, as we all know, for air pollution. The provision 4 of High-Speed Rail provides another alternative. 5 And when it comes to looking at air transport PSG7-10 6 service, the San Joaquin Valley doesn't take a backseat 7 to anybody in terms of poor airport and aviation 8 service. High-Speed Rail is being counted on to 9 provide alternatives that make sense for the State of 10 California in the future, for our environment as well 11 as for the people in the San Joaquin Valley. 12 We thank you for coming to Stockton on 13 PSG7-11 September 18th. That is very good of the Authority and 14 for the staff to make time in the schedule to make that 15 happen. So thank you very much. We'll see you on the 16 September 18th. 17 BOARD MEMBER ROD DIRIDON: Thank you for being 18 here and for coming such a long distance. Good luck on 19 152 going back. 20 ANDREW CHESLEY: Well, the temperature wasn't that 21 big a difference. 22 23 BOARD MEMBER ROD DIRIDON: I'm struggling with this name. Is it Pereira? 24

DON PEREIRA: Don Pereira.

25

BOARD MEMBER ROD DIRIDON: I'm Italian, so I 1 should be able to get that. 2 DON PEREIRA: Well, it's Portuguese, so.... 3 BOARD MEMBER ROD DIRIDON: Oh, well. 4 Followed by Jim Helmer. 5 DON PEREIRA: My interest is a bit different from 6 PSG8-1 the rest. I'm a property owner on 152. And I've 7 probably misunderstood, this isn't the 8 question-and-answer thing. So what I'll do is say that 9 I would like extreme consideration for the property 10 owners that this will interfere with. We live in a 11 PSG8-2 pretty tranquil atmosphere. It's very quiet. And I 12 have fears of noise and vibrations. And it appears 13 PSG8-3 from the map, which isn't really clear, but I'm going 14 to be getting a better clarification on that -- but it 15 might be coming right through my property. So I do 16 have questions about that. And I guess there's other 17 PSG8-4 means of getting answers? 18 BOARD MEMBER ROD DIRIDON: I should have clarified 19 this at the beginning. We're not allowed to respond to 20 you during the public hearings. 21 DON PEREIRA: That's fine. 22 23 BOARD MEMBER ROD DIRIDON: We're to hear only from you. After the session though, if you'd like to stay 24 around, the consultants will be able to answer your 25

questions outside in the foyer area. And the intent, of course, is to be as responsive as possible to all of the residents, no matter what corridor is chosen.

DON PEREIRA: Thank you very much. And I choose the Altamont corridor.

PSG8-5

BOARD MEMBER ROD DIRIDON: Thank you for your testimony.

Jim Helmer, who is testifying today as a Santa Cruz County resident, though he's also employed by the City of San Jose. And he'll be followed by Sheri Barger -- I believe is the way it's pronounced.

JIM HELMER: Thank you for the opportunity to speak today, Commissioner Diridon and members of the public.

As mentioned, I have testified on behalf of PSG9-1 the City of San Jose both at the San Jose hearing and the Livermore hearing earlier this week. And today I'm speaking really as a long-time native central coast resident from Santa Cruz County and speaking really to remind the Commission of the approximately 1 million or so residents that live here in the tri-county region down here of San Benito, Monterey, and Santa Cruz.

And I think it is important to remember what an internationally acclaimed recreational and tourist destination point the Monterey Bay is. And that's a

PSG9-2

very important consideration when we look at that type of travel going up and down the long spine of the State of California so that we can access the coast.

PSG9-2 Cont.

As a Santa Cruz County resident, I have very limited options for air travel to Southern California. Generally, I have to drive an hour to two hours to the north to get to San Jose, Oakland, or San Francisco International to make any kind of a reasonable and cost-effective trip to Southern California. And in that one to two hours, I could have already been there had I had the option to take an hour-and-50-minute High-Speed Rail trip from Gilroy to Downtown Los Angeles.

PSG9-3

We've also discussed the fact that from Gilroy, where we are today, to the north to San Francisco, which is the preferred starter route, San Francisco to L.A, the 79 miles of CalTrain right of way is secured. Other options, such as the Altamont, pose major, major obstacles to secure right of way and environmental clearance.

PSG9-4

And to think that we could cross the San PSG9-5
Francisco Bay with our ending destination point in San
Francisco is a very difficult thing to envision in any
kind of a near-term time frame. And to think that with
could get to San Francisco by coming across Altamont

and somehow circling the Bay, possibly to the south through San Jose, we would only be paralleling the new BART alignment. So we would be building another rail system alongside of BART and existing heavy rail that already exists there.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

To use the 79-mile corridor of the CalTrain PSG9-6 corridor to the north of Gilroy, we would be able to electrify; we would be able to grade separate; and we would be able to reduce congestion on our local freeways. CalTrain, which is extending to Salinas -and I'm proud to announce the City of San Jose has unanimously endorsed that extension -- but CalTrain's vision is really fourfold.

They see themselves as a local train service to the greater Bay Area, up and down the Peninsula. They see themselves as a Baby Bullet service from San Jose to San Francisco in one hour. And they see themselves as a feeder service to High-Speed Rail to the greatest population center that we were talking about today. And lastly, they see themselves as a freight service on weekends and nights.

So in conclusion, after going to several hearings, reading the reports, I really believe what we need to do is focus on the desirability of accessing San Francisco to L.A. to Anaheim in the most logical

PSG9-9

PSG9-5 Cont.

PSG9-7

PSG9-8

route. And that would be from San Francisco through
San Jose with Gilroy as a hub and Merced as a hub as we
proceed south to L.A. and Anaheim.

But I also believe that this should be a spine PSG9-10 up the central portion of state from L.A. towards

Sacramento to better serve the San Joaquin residents in that very important corridor. And then finally on east-west, shorter routes, which is the case, we should be really thinking about extending BART across Altamont or building better regional rail service to serve population centers that continue to need better east-west travel between the job employment center and agricultural regions and other regions in the Central Valley.

So with that, I'll close. Thank you very much.

BOARD MEMBER ROD DIRIDON: Thank you, and thanks for providing testimony prior to this time, too.

SHERI BARGER: I'm Sheri Barger. I had a question, so I'll wait until after the meeting to ask that.

BOARD MEMBER ROD DIRIDON: Sure.

Any of you who have questions, please join the staff right after we convene the -- or adjourn the session here, and they'll try to answer your questions.

PSG9-9

Cont.

Thank you.

And Joe Thompson, an old friend, followed by John Scherrer.

Good behavior today, Joe.

JOE THOMPSON: Yes, your Honor. Oh, it's not him.

Mr. Vice Chair -- or is it Supervisor? You've worn so

many hats, I don't know exactly how to --

BOARD MEMBER ROD DIRIDON: Just "Rod," Joe.

JOE THOMPSON: My name is Joe Thompson, as you know, supervisors and council members. As Rod -- he allows me to call him that. He can call me "Turkey," by the way.

As Rod knows, I was fortunate to do

post-doctoral study at what he calls the Mineta

Institute. And I was also fortunate to be there when

Rod convened the 1995 annual meeting of the Mineta

Institute -- to shorten its name a little bit -- when

we heard the future secretary of transportation say,

"The crucial question in transportation today is, what

should government do and what should it leave to

others?"

Now, time is short, and attorneys can be long PSG10-2 winded. So I respectfully request that you accept my written statement again. This is the sixth time in ten PSG10-3 years that I've had the pleasure of coming before you

PSG10-1

Cont.

and the Commission, as Mr. Leavitt knows -- or now that |PSG10-3| you're an Authority -- and say the same thing I've been saying. You know, at least the devil is consistent. And I've said before and I'll say it again, if you put enough FedEx, UPS and Postal Service tonnage on that train, you wouldn't have to ask the taxpayers for a dime.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

This horn (indicating) is from the Union Railroad, from my uncle, which was a belt line around the steel mills when we had them near Pittsburgh, where I was born.

As you know, my undergraduate from San Jose State was in history. And I've had the pleasure of doing the post-doctoral study there and reviewing and annotating all of the transportation works in the Undergraduate Library, in large part, thanks to you for creating that institute and motivating me.

But from my study of the railroads in the United States, since John Thompson built the first railroad in Delaware County, Pennsylvania in 1809, and reviewing them all since then, it's my conclusion that there's three types of railroads. There's railroads that look as good as gold (indicating), but turn out to be fool's gold. There's railroads that have a silver shine to them (indicating), especially for people like

PSG10-3 Cont.

PSG10-4

the founders of the Credit Mobilier -- and possibly

Bechtel Corporation if they're successful in pushing

this through. And there's the other kind of railroad.

I worked for the SP near what we used to call the

Cahill Station -- but which now has a different name -
for five years. And then I had the pleasure of working

for Union Pacific as their local complaint clerk. You

think I get called names as an attorney, you should

have enjoyed that position for ten years as the

complaint clerk around here.

Those railroads have a source of funding that have made them the envy of the world today. Unlike what we see in France, where they've had to decimate the middle class to do things like the bullet train, and unlike in Japan, as I've told your committee or your commission before, we're not packed so densely as the Japanese -- "So how would you do it, Joe? How would you make that bullet train run without putting the onus on the backs of the taxpayers like we do with the other kinds of mass transit?"

I say, do it the way the canal people did on that portrait I gave you about ten years ago that you put up in your office. They moved passengers and freight, and they didn't have to ask the taxpayers for a dime.

By the way, this is the 37th anniversary, I 1 PSG10-5 quess you know, of congressmen standing up in Congress 2 in 1970, during the debates on the creation of the 3 National Railroad Passenger Corporation, in which some 4 of them said Amtrak would be self-sufficient in three 5 years. So much for their crystal ball. 6 By September the 11th of 2001, according to 7 Traffic World Magazine, the taxpayers had thrown about 8 \$30 billion of subsidies to Amtrak, but did we have 9 adequate airport security? No. 10 So I commend you for your lifetime of 11 PSG10-6 dedication to our community, to our county, to our 12 state. And I thank you all very much. But my point of 13 view hasn't changed. But I guess you know that. 14 Good talking to you on the Ronn Owens show. 15 BOARD MEMBER DIRIDON: Thank you. 16 Next, John Scherrer will be followed by Tom 17 18 Hermann. JOHN SCHERRER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. My name | PSG11-1 19 is John W. Scherrer, and I own several thousands acres 20 of land on Pacheco Pass highway, extending from Lovers 21 Leap, which is across from Bell Station, eastward about 22 23 four and a half miles almost to the top of the pass.

I'm not here this evening to speak against your proposed route. In fact, I'm very much in favor

24

25

PSG11-2

of it. It makes much more sense to me than the

Altamont Pass. But I just want to make you aware of a

couple of concerns that I have regarding my property.

PSG11-2 Cont.

PSG11-3

In looking at the maps outside there, you propose to -- by the way, the south fork of the Pacheco Creek cuts right through the center of my property.

And according to those maps, you propose to go overland over the south fork of the Pacheco on my property.

My concern is that several years ago I entered a land conservation agreement with the federal government, extending from about a half a mile from the highway, going upstream on the Pacheco Creek, center line Pacheco -- south fork of the Pacheco, that is -- 300 feet on each side. As a result, I'm not allowed to develop anything on top of that land. And that is recorded with the County.

PSG11-4

On the other hand, if you go downstream from that point, you're going through the -- there's a disposal site where they had the material that came out from the San Felipe Tunnel. And you would probably be going due left, and you're bumping right into the outlet for the San Felipe Tunnel.

PSG11-5

So the only alternative that I can see in order -- if you're going to build over that land conservation agreement area, the State would have to

enter into some kind of an agreement with the federal government to get a variance to do that.

I just wanted to make you aware of that problem.

BOARD MEMBER ROD DIRIDON: Thank you for the caution.

JOHN SCHERRER: You bet.

BOARD MEMBER ROD DIRIDON: And thank you for being such a farsighted person as to develop the agreement in the first place.

Tom Hermann will be followed by Gabriel Santos.

TOM HERMANN: Thank you for the opportunity to speak here. I'm actually here as both a Morgan Hill resident as well as a businessman who travels very frequently to the point where I flew back in from the East Coast this morning, just long enough to change into some more comfortable clothes because of the heat, changing out of the suit.

So I'll start with the business perspective PSG12-2 first. Actually, I'm a very avid supporter of high-speed rail systems. I've ridden them all over the world. Every single one that you've mentioned here, for sure, I've ridden on: the one in Japan, the one in Germany, in France. I'll be back in Europe next week

PSG11-5

PSG12-1

Cont.

PSG12-2 Cont.

and traveling -- be in Frankfurt in Europe on the ICE because that's still the fastest connection for me when I've got business meetings in various cities.

So at that, I'm a very avid supporter, even from a local perspective too. And I'm hearing some of the other comments here about commuter traffic and alleviation and so on. That's a huge, huge benefit for us on the business travel set, even as a resident, to be able to shoot up the Peninsula faster if we have to. I have frequent meetings in Los Angeles, and that would ideal for me. So one of the comments I actually wanted to make is obviously I'm a very strong supporter of the Pacheco Pass alternative, especially from the perspective of even a lot of my employees who live in this area, who live up in San Jose, who frequently travel down to L.A.

I personally believe that's probably your larger constituents of people. Your larger pull in the future even is the business travelers that reside in this part of the Valley. I hear the alternative comments for Altamont, and I agree with the gentleman from Santa Cruz. I'd rather see some other alternative for that corridor and really address the population that is going to be your primary audience -- traveling from Northern California to Southern California, both

on the business side as well as the tourism traffic that was pointed out with Monterey and other areas.

PSG12-2 Cont.

think that's a great option for them to take that type of route.

So again, very strong supporter of the Pacheco Pass alternative from a business perspective.

PSG12-3

As a Morgan Hill resident, likewise, the only thing I wanted to voice was one concern just in terms of the impact of any additional rail traffic through towns like Morgan Hill and Gilroy. We have a lot of railroad crossings. So one of the concerns is just in terms of how that is being addressed, whether it's elevated. I looked at some of your plans on line; looks like there may be some consideration for raising the track -- but you know, safety concerns, the impact on traffic, obviously, just making sure that that is being considered.

The last thing we really need as residents is longer wait lines, when all the freight trains and CalTrain, all that stuff already comes through. We spend a long time sitting at lights and adding to local pollution and so on in the cars.

So thank you very much.

BOARD MEMBER ROD DIRIDON: If you would like to wait just a moment, we can answer those questions

outside.

TOM HERMANN: Excellent. Thank you.

BOARD MEMBER ROD DIRIDON: Thank you for providing testimony.

Our last speaker is Gabriel Santos from Los Banos.

GABRIEL SANTOS: Hi. I'm a citizen -- I'm Gabriel PSG13-1
Santos. And I'm a citizen, resident of Los Banos, over
the hill. And I sort of wanted to give you my concerns
of someone who has lived on the other -- in the Central
Valley. And I don't know if I'm the only one. I think
I may be. Another person may be from the Central
Valley.

But my concerns are regarding the effect, the environmental effect this whole -- the dot-com boom the Silicon Valley world has had on the Central Valley.

And I'm hoping that the California High-Speed Rail Authority will take into account the bigger picture of California.

The way I see it is that a lot of these local communities, like Gilroy, Morgan Hill, they restricted any sort of urban growth here in this area. But all the real jobs were created in Silicon Valley companies like Google, Yahoo. So there was a big explosion for those type of jobs, high-paying jobs. And how it

PSG13-1 Cont.

affected the Central Valley. And those types of high-tech jobs, they also have a lot of support that's needed for those jobs, caterers and other type -- police officers. And they can't -- they couldn't afford the expensive housing that was -- that's available here in the Coastal Region. So a lot of them -- a lot of these people have to commute over the hill.

And so basically, I'm hoping that the California High-Speed Rail Authority will consider trying to find solutions to these problems and also to also consider, you know -- because you have a crystal ball, you're really -- you're making decisions now that may not be implemented until maybe 30 or 40 years from now. And there's a lot of other type of technology. There's a technology called telepresence, which is -- if Cisco had their way, they would want the high-speed Internet to be at 100 megabits per second.

What that means is that, if they created these satellite areas for work -- it could be your home, it could be a special building in the community. And they would have these, you know, very high-definition type of television screens or type of virtual reality space. And there wouldn't really be a strong need to commute to another area.

PSG13-1 Cont.

So you may want to consider that because of the cost involved to create a system that, from what I read in the San Jose Mercury News, is billions of dollars a year just to operate the system. So whether that -- and then there's something called heliporting technology. It's sort of an air traffic-controlled type of system, where it's all run by computers so you don't have to be a certified pilot to get on a plane.

And you know, they're going to go from some airport-port plane there, and then they're going to travel. They can commute that way. The plane will actually be flying itself.

So I just wanted to bring those issues up to consider those, you know, because this is 40 years down the line, and who knows. And so that's all I want the say.

Thank you.

BOARD MEMBER ROD DIRIDON: Thank you Gabriel.

We do have a final speaker, and that's Rod Jensen.

ROD JENSEN: Thank you. I waited to see if I wouldn't be redundant.

My name is Rod Jensen, and I'm here as a PSG14-1 business person. I live in Santa Cruz County, and I'm excited about the possibilities of this High-Speed

For me as a business person, I'm finding my

PSG14-1 Cont.

2

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

clients are up and down the coast, Los Angeles. with globalization, I'm finding I even have to move down into Mexico to find suppliers. So the idea of a train, high-speed, for connecting to my customers and clients is very important to me.

PSG14-2

Flipping the switch a little bit compared to the last speaker, I want to talk about the history of trains. And Rod, you probably know a little about that. But the reason that we have that corridor between San Jose and San Francisco was because of the foresight of the Southern Pacific Company.

And if we look at the history of trains in California, the most successful train of all time was the Coast Daylight, the most successful, financially.

But the Southern Pacific also had the foresight to know that one train down the coast wasn't They had one in the Valley also. enough.

So my point to you today is, two thirds of your passengers are going to be coming from San Francisco. That Valley is where you're putting the main line track. You need both. So let's not make this an either/or. We want both. We want a track to San Francisco; we want a connection in San Jose. we need to go up the East Bay because those people also

PSG14-2 deserve the same level of service. 1 Cont. And Southern Pacific knew that. And I would 2 just ask that you consider history in your decision. 3 Thank you. 4 BOARD MEMBER ROD DIRIDON: Thank you very much. 5 That ends it on a kind of a happy note. Are there any 6 other comments that any would care to offer today? 7 JACK STURLE: Can I make a comment from here? 8 BOARD MEMBER ROD DIRIDON: Go right ahead. 9 need your name on the card in order to make sure we 10 don't get it wrong in the record. 11 JACK STURLE: My name is Jack Sturle. I live on 12 Holsclaw Road, which is just east of Gilroy. 13 I've seen a lot of publicity on the good 14 things about the bullet train or the -- I guess that's 15 one of the names. 16 BOARD MEMBER ROD DIRIDON: Good enough. 17 JACK STURLE: But I've never seen anything in the |PSG15-1 18 papers that tells you -- tells property owners how wide 19 the right of way is and how many trains a day are going PSG15-2 20 to be going through. 21 Now, this means a hell of a lot to the PSG15-3 22 23 property owners -- through the farmland. And you're probably not going to answer this today. 24 BOARD MEMBER ROD DIRIDON: We can't answer it from 25

here, but once we step outside into the foyer area, they can answer that question for you.

JACK STURLE: Now, if Gilroy -- if the Pacheco
Pass route is the final choice, and it looks like
that's going to be, then what the City of Gilroy does
is going to affect the farmland all on the east side of
Gilroy. If Gilroy doesn't want it to come down the
Southern Pacific or Union Pacific tracks, it's going to
veer off north of Gilroy and come out through the
farmland, cross the Llagas Creek. And the effects on
the farmland is something that really should be, you
know, given a lot of attention.

And before anything comes up on a ballot for a PSG15-5 bond issue, all these property owners should be aware of the final choice. The final route should be known long before you put a bond issue up.

Anyway, that's basically my comments.

Thank you very much.

BOARD MEMBER ROD DIRIDON: Thank you for coming forward. And please do fill the card out so we can have the information properly on the record.

Thank you.

Any other comments? We're very pleased to have you all here today, and remember that our next hearing is 4:00 in the afternoon tomorrow, in Merced,

PSG15-4

in the city council chambers. And our last hearing, then, will be on the 18th of September in the Stockton City Council -- Stockton Counsel of Government Chambers. This meeting is adjourned. LARRY COPE: We support -- in fact, we support and $\left| {PSG16-1} \right|$ recommend the Pacheco Pass route. We feel it has the best possibility of success going from north to south because of where all the commuters are at, and that we also feel that it would be the most beneficial to, one, traffic congestion, the environment, effects of all the cars on the road, plus where the future growth is happening in the -- not only the Central Coast but the Central Valley. So that's it. (Whereupon, the proceedings adjourned at 6:00 o'clock p.m.)

STATE OF CALIFORNIA SS. COUNTY OF MARIN) I, DEBORAH FUQUA, a Certified Shorthand Reporter of the State of California, do hereby certify that the foregoing proceedings were reported by me, a disinterested person, and thereafter transcribed under my direction into typewriting and is a true and correct transcription of said proceedings. I further certify that I am not of counsel or attorney for either or any of the parties in the foregoing proceeding and caption named, nor in any way interested in the outcome of the cause named in said caption. Dated the 11th day of September, 2007. DEBORAH FUQUA CSR NO. 12948

1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	